Report - MH2029 - 2020-05-18

Respondents: 1
Answer Count: 1
Answer Frequency: 100.00%

Please note that there is only one respondent to this form: the person that performs the course analysis.

Course analysis carried out by (name, e-mail):

parj@kth.se

DESCRIPTION OF THE COURSE EVALUATION PROCESS
Describe the course evaluation process. Describe how all students have been given the possibility to give their opinions on the course. Describe how aspects regarding gender, and disabled students are investigated.

The students have completed a LEQ, where 10 out of 16 students answered the LEQ.

DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS
Describe which meetings that has been arranged with students during the course and after its completion. (The outcomes of these meetings should be reported under 7, below.)

No specific meetings, but teachers have obtained information from lectures given and responded to students questions.

COURSE DESIGN
Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.

The overall aims of the course are:
• To develop students' knowledge of current methods to produce base metals from natural ores and recycled materials with focus on steel, which are most relevant for the Swedish steel industry. However, the production of aluminum and silicon is also discussed to exemplify the production other metal as well as other production concepts.
• To develop students' individual skills at performing relevant thermodynamic calculations for the extraction of base metals with focus on steel.
• To develop students' individual skills at interpreting the significance of the results of these calculations.

Course requirements:
Exam (TEN1), 4 p.
Home assignment (ÖVN1: 2p) Computer lab steel production, participation and written report.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD
Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

Students spent between 3-8 hours per week, which corresponds to the expected levels.

THE STUDENTS' RESULTS
How well have the students succeeded on the course? If there are significant differences compared to previous course offerings, what can be the reason?

The sixteen students received the following grades:

A: 6
B: 7
C: 3

This is better than previous years. Especially the calculation performance was better than normal.We believe that this is due to that we have been very open with letting students asking questions and they have responded well to this openess.

STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS
What does students say in response to the open questions?

What was the best aspect of the course?

The professor was knowledgable about the subject and attempted to provide clarity on any confusion.
The way lectures were conducted
General knowledges about the process of making steel.
The way it was presented in a clear and simple way
I enjoyed the steel lab and that the lectures always involved some discussions.

What would you suggest to improve?

To prepare students for steel university by practicing before going to the laboratory
More practice exercises done in class
Sometimes the lectures very taught very slowly
From the start : explain the paths of steel making process and then explain the differents steps. Because I was a bit lost from the start. If you learn all about blast furnace but you don't in witch step it is, then it's a bit confusing-

What advice would you like to give to future participants?

Go to class
Not to miss lectures
Make a recap of each course.
Don’t miss a class
Learn the graphics presented and the chemical equations.

Is there anything else you would like to add?

Andrey makes one fall in love with process
It was an interesting course but maybe I would have also like to do more than just 90% steel and then aluminium a bit. But also other type of metals.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS
Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

Overall, the students thought it was an interesting course and that the material was presented in a clear way.
Some students expressed that they need a better introduction to th esteel University lab, but they were satisfied with the lab itself.

OVERALL IMPRESSION
Summarize the teachers’ overall impressions of the course offering in relation to students’ results and their evaluation of the course, as well as in relation to the changes implemented since last course offering.

I Think that this course could be seen as a mature course where the teachers has modified the course based on previous students opinions.
The student performed very well since the teachers were able to teach them the important parts of the course material.

ANALYSIS

Is it possible to identify stronger and weaker areas in the learning environment based on the information you have gathered during the evaluation and analysis process? What can the reason for these be? Are there significant difference in experience between:
- students identifying as female and male?
- international and national students?
- students with or without disabilities?

No, to few students in the class.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

What aspects of the course should be developed primaily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

No major Changes since the course works well. Maybe a slight improvement in the explanation to the steel University lab.